

REMARKS

Claims 2 and 4-20 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 2 and 4 have been rewritten in independent form, and claims 1 and 3 have been canceled.

As claims 2 and 4 have merely been rewritten in independent form, Applicants respectfully submit that such changes do not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment should be entered.

I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Strolle et al. (U.S. 5,673,355). As noted above, claims 1 and 3 have been canceled, and claims 2 and 4 have been rewritten in independent form so as to include all of the limitations of base claim 1.

A. Claim 2

Claim 2 recites that a first predetermined frequency component is extracted by filtering the luminance signal in a horizontal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 3.58MHz, and further filtering the luminance signal in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15Hz. Applicants respectfully submit that Strolle does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 2.

The Examiner alleges in the Office Action that Strolle discloses at col. 3, lines 37-63 that a first predetermined frequency component is extracted by filtering a luminance signal with a horizontal filter having a pass-band of 3.58 MHz, and that Strolle discloses at col. 18, lines 14-20 that the signal is further filtered in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass band of 15

Hz. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Regarding the disclosure at col. 3, lines 37-63 of Strolle, Applicants note that this passage merely describes a construction of a composite video signal (i.e., a video signal composed by the luminance signal and the chrominance signal) encoded in quadrature amplitude modulation of a suppressed 3.58 MHz color subcarrier.

Thus, while Strolle discloses a composite video signal that is encoded in a quadrature amplitude modulation of a suppressed 3.58 MHz color subcarrier, Applicants respectfully submit that such disclosure in no way whatsoever corresponds to a first predetermined frequency component being extracted by filtering a luminance signal in a horizontal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 3.58 MHz, as recited in claim 2.

If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to explain with particularity how the disclosure of Strolle meets this claim feature so that Applicants may make an informed decision with regard to appeal.

Further, regarding the disclosure at col. 18, lines 14-20 of Strolle, at which the Examiner asserts that Strolle discloses the feature of further filtering the luminance signal in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15 Hz, Applicants note that this passage recites that folded highs alternate in phase at 15 Hz, and therefore, that it is impractical to detect frame-to-frame motion after folding the luminance signal frequency spectrum (see col. 18, lines 14-18).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that while such disclosure indicates that folded highs alternate in phase at 15 Hz, there is no absolutely disclosure in Strolle of further filtering the luminance signal with a filter having a pass-band of 15 Hz, as recited in claim 2.

Further, as pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action, Strolle indicates that motion is detected by temporal differencing and spatial lowpass filtering (see col. 18, lines 18-20).

Applicants respectfully submit, however, that while Strolle detects motion by temporal differencing and spatial lowpass filtering, such disclosure in no way whatsoever corresponds to further filtering a luminance signal in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15Hz, as recited in claim 2.

If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants kindly request the Examiner to explain with particularity how the disclosure of Strolle meets this claim feature so that Applicants may make an informed decision with regard to appeal.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Strolle fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the features of a first predetermined frequency component being extracted by filtering the luminance signal in a horizontal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 3.58MHz, and further filtering the luminance signal in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15Hz, as recited in claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 2 is patentable over Strolle, an indication of which is kindly requested.

B. Claim 4

Regarding claim 4, Applicants note that this claim recites that the second predetermined frequency component is obtained by filtering the luminance signal in a horizontal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 3.58MHz, and further filtering the luminance signal in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15Hz.

As noted above, Strolle disclose that a composite video signal is encoded in a quadrature amplitude modulation of a suppressed 3.58 MHz color subcarrier, and that motion is detected by temporal differencing and spatial lowpass filtering of the separated baseband luminance prior to folding.

For at least similar reasons as discussed above, however, Applicants respectfully submit that such disclosure does not in any way suggest that the second predetermined frequency component is obtained by filtering the luminance signal in a horizontal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 3.58MHz, and further filtering the luminance signal in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15Hz, as recited in claim 4.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 4 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested.

C. Claims 15 and 16

Regarding claim 15, Applicants note that this claim recites the feature of eliminating a second predetermined frequency component from the luminance signal components according to a size of the first predetermined frequency component when elimination of dot crawls is designated. Applicants respectfully submit that Strolle fails to disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious at least this feature of claim 15.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 2. Applicant notes, however, that the above-noted feature recited in claim 15 is not present within claims 1 and 2.

In particular, Applicants note that while claim 2 (claim 2 has been amended to include all of the features recited in claim 1) recites the feature of “eliminating a second predetermined frequency component from the luminance signal”, claim 2 does not recite that the second predetermined frequency component is eliminated from “the luminance signal components according to a size of the first predetermined frequency component when elimination of the dot crawls is designated”, as recited in claim 15.

Applicants respectfully submit that Strolle does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious the above-noted feature recited in claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 15 is patentable over Strolle, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claim 16 depends from claim 15 and is therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of its dependency.

In addition, regarding claim 16, Applicants note that this claim recites that the first predetermined frequency component is extracted by filtering the luminance signal components in a horizontal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 3.58MHz, and further filtering the luminance signal components in a temporal direction with a filter having a pass-band of 15Hz. For at least similar reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 2, Applicants submit that Strolle fails to disclose or suggest such features.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 16 is patentable over Strolle, an indication of which is respectfully requested.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 5-14 and 17-20 are allowed.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Satoshi KONDO et al.

By: Kenneth W. Fields
Kenneth W. Fields
Registration No. 52,430
Attorney for Applicant

KWF/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
September 6, 2005